

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action mailed on July 27, 2005. Claims 1-16 are pending in the patent application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' alleged admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,633,932 to Bork et al. ("Bork"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the combination of Applicants' alleged admitted prior art and *Bork* does not disclose, teach or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a wireless transmission apparatus including a wired network port for exchanging data with a computer, a wireless network port including a radio frequency circuit module and a processing unit for converting the data format transmitted between the wired network port and the wireless network port. The apparatus also includes a power port electrically connected to a universal series bus of the computer, by which the wireless transmission apparatus is powered and a power controller electrically connected to the power port, wherein the power controller comprises a voltage transformer adapted to convert a voltage of the power port to a voltage suitable for the operation of the wireless transmission apparatus and a power-saving controller adapted to suspend the power supply to the radio frequency circuit module according to a power control signal generated by the processing unit. The cited combination does not disclose, teach or suggest the elements of claim 1.

The Office Action states that Applicants' alleged admitted prior art teaches all of the elements of claim 1 except for a power port electrically connected to a universal series bus (USB) of the computer. The Office Action therefore attempts to remedy this deficiency with *Bork*.

Bork is directed to a method and apparatus for using a universal serial bus to provide power to a portable electronic device. As shown in Figs. 13-14, the apparatus includes a computer 26 having an external USB connector that is coupled to a portable electronic device such as a cell phone via a cable. The cable includes electronic circuitry that converts the voltage level supplied by the USB to a usable voltage level for the portable electronic device. (See the Abstract, Col. 6, lines 43-65). However, *Bork* does not disclose, teach or suggest a wireless transmission device, such as a cell phone, which includes a power controller having a voltage transformer and a power-saving controller as in amended claim 1. Instead, voltage or power conversion occurs in the connector 40 and is then transferred to the wireless apparatus or cell phone. (Col. 6, lines 39-42; Fig. 13).

For at least these reasons, amended claim 1 and claims 3 and 4, which depend from amended claim 1, are each patentably distinguished over the combination of Applicants' alleged admitted prior art and *Bork* and in condition for allowance.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' alleged admitted prior art and *Bork* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,465,400 to Norimatsu ("Norimatsu"). Claim 2 depends from amended claim 1. Therefore, claim 2 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for amended claim 1 because *Norimatsu* does not disclose, teach or suggest a wireless transmission device including a power controller having a voltage transformer and a power-saving controller as in amended claim 1.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' alleged admitted prior art and *Bork* in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0185777 to Bryson ("Bryson"). Claim 5 depends from amended claim 1. Therefore, claim 5 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for amended claim 1 because the combination of Applicants'

alleged admitted prior art, *Bork* and *Bryson* simply does not disclose, teach or suggest the elements of claim 5 in combination with the elements of amended claim 1.

Claims 6 and 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' alleged admitted prior art and *Bork* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,970,062 to *Bauchot* ("*Bauchot*"). Claims 6 and 7 depend from amended claim 1. Therefore, claim 6 and 7 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for amended claim 1 because the combination of Applicants' alleged admitted prior art, *Bork* and *Bauchot* simply does not disclose, teach or suggest the elements of claims 6 and 7 in combination with the elements of amended claim 1.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 3-7 are patentable over the art of record because the cited art does not disclose, teach or suggest all of the elements of these claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that claims 1 and 3-7 be deemed allowable at this time and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/687,365
Response to Office Action mailed on July 27, 2005

No fees are due. If any other fees are due in connection with this application, the Patent Office is authorized to deduct the fees from Deposit Account No. 19-1351. If such withdrawal is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (33038-406500) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

Seyfarth Shaw LLP
Attorneys for Assignee
55 East Monroe Street
Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5803
312-346-8000

By Chris Hermanson
Christopher S. Hermanson
Reg. No. 48,244
Attorney for Applicant